



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

fw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,617	10/18/2001	Michael R. Boyd	65783-0007	8210

10291 7590 07/03/2006

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
39533 WOODWARD AVENUE
SUITE 140
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-0610

EXAMINER

SHELEHEDA, JAMES R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/982,617

Applicant(s)

BOYD ET AL.

Examiner

James Sheleheda

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/7/06, 3/10/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 17, 19, 22, 24-30, 32, 33, 36, 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lavelle et al. (Lavelle) (6,678,892) (of record).

As to claim 1, Lavelle discloses a multi-format decoder board for decoding audiovisual data streams in a plurality of encoding formats for use by one or more audiovisual devices (Figs. 1A and 1B), said decoder board comprising:

an interface stage (input/output interfaces; column 3, lines 25-43) for interfacing with a digital data network (bus interconnecting the plurality of devices; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 7 and column 9, line 60-column 10, line 2);

a multi-format decoder (127) for decoding at least two different encoding formats for an audiovisual data stream (column 6, lines 28-42, column 4, lines 16-40 and column 7, lines 8-29);

a microcontroller for controlling said interface stage and said decoder (controlling the system; column 3, lines 25-45); and

connections for connecting said decoder board (input/output interfaces; column 3, lines 25-43) to one or more audiovisual output devices (display, 112 and wireless headphones; column 4, lines 18-20 and lines 20-65).

As to claim 4, Lavelle discloses wherein said connections for one or more audiovisual output devices comprise a connection for a display device (112, column 5, lines 23-29).

As to claim 7, Lavelle discloses wherein said decoder outputs a decoded audio signal to said interface stage for transmission over said digital network (column 6, lines 20-42).

As to claim 9, Lavelle discloses wherein said decoder decodes a data stream output by any of a dvd player (column 4, lines 16-30) or a wireless receiver (column 4, lines 16-30).

As to claim 11, Lavelle discloses a multimedia system in a vehicle (Figs. 1A and 1B), comprising:

a digital data network installed in a vehicle (bus interconnecting the plurality of devices; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 7 and column 9, line 60-column 10, line 2);

at least one storage, playback or receiver device on-board said vehicle (column 4, lines 16-30) for providing an encoded audiovisual stream to said digital data network (column 6, lines 28-42);

at least one audiovisual output device connected to said digital data network (display, 112 and wireless headphones; column 4, lines 18-20 and lines 20-65); and

a multi-format decoder board (column 3, lines 25-44) for decoding audiovisual data streams in a plurality of encoding formats (column 4, lines 20-28 and column 6, lines 28-42), said decoder board decoding said audiovisual data stream for use by said at least one audiovisual output device (column 4, lines 18-20 and lines 20-65), wherein said decoder board comprises:

an interface stage (input/output interfaces; column 3, lines 25-43) for interfacing with the digital data network (bus interconnecting the plurality of devices; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 7 and column 9, line 60-column 10, line 2);

a multi-format decoder (127) for decoding at least two different encoding formats for an audiovisual data stream (column 6, lines 28-42, column 4, lines 16-40 and column 7, lines 8-29);

a microcontroller for controlling said interface stage and said decoder (controlling the system; column 3, lines 25-45); and

connections for connecting said decoder board (input/output interfaces; column 3, lines 25-43) to one or more audiovisual output devices (display, 112 and wireless headphones; column 4, lines 18-20 and lines 20-65).

As to claim 14, Lavelle discloses wherein said at least one audiovisual output device comprises a display device (112) and said connections for one or more audiovisual output devices comprise a connection for said display device (column 5, line 48-column 6, line 8).

As to claim 17, Lavelle discloses wherein said decoder outputs a decoded audio signal to said interface stage for transmission over said digital network (column 6, lines 9-42).

As to claim 19, Lavelle discloses wherein said decoder decodes a data stream output by any of a dvd player (column 4, lines 16-30) or a wireless receiver (column 4, lines 16-30).

As to claim 22, Lavelle discloses an electronic memory unit connected to said digital data network (column 3, lines 33-36 and column 7, lines 35-50).

As to claim 24, Lavelle discloses an analog antenna and tuner connected to said digital data network (column 4, lines 20-25 and column 5, lines 8-14).

As to claim 25, Lavelle discloses a satellite antenna connected to said digital data network (column 5, lines 14-29).

As to claim 26, Lavelle discloses a DVD player connected to said digital data network (column 4, lines 20-25).

As to claim 27, Lavelle discloses an audio player connected to said digital data network (column 4, lines 16-40).

As to claim 28, Lavelle discloses a CD-ROM drive connected to said digital data network (column 4, lines 18-25).

As to claim 29, Lavelle discloses a method of handling a digital data stream carrying data encoded in a plurality of different encoding formats (column 6, lines 28-42, column 4, lines 16-40 and column 7, lines 8-29), said method comprising processing said digital data stream through a decoder board that comprises a multi-format decoder (127) for decoding at least two different encoding formats for an audiovisual data stream (column 6, lines 28-42, column 4, lines 16-40 and column 7, lines 8-29) and output a resulting a decoded audiovisual signal to one or more audiovisual output devices (display, 112 and wireless headphones; column 4, lines 18-20 and lines 20-65).

As to claim 30, Lavelle discloses interfacing said decoder board to a digital data network (bus interconnecting the plurality of devices; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 7 and column 9, line 60-column 10, line 2) with an interface stage (input/output interfaces;

Art Unit: 2623

column 3, lines 25-43), said digital data stream coming to said decoder board via said digital data network (Fig. 1A, column 6, lines 9-42).

As to claim 32, Lavelle discloses outputting a decoded audio signal to a pair of headphones (column 4, lines 30-65).

As to claim 33, Lavelle discloses outputting a decoded audiovisual signal to a display device (column 5, lines 9-27).

As to claim 36, Lavelle discloses a multi-format decoder board for decoding audiovisual data streams in a plurality of encoding formats for use by one or more audiovisual devices (Figs. 1A and 1B), said decoder board comprising:

an interface means (input/output interfaces; column 3, lines 25-43) for interfacing with a digital data network (bus interconnecting the plurality of devices; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 7 and column 9, line 60-column 10, line 2);

a multi-format decoder means (127) for decoding at least two different encoding formats for an audiovisual data stream (column 6, lines 28-42, column 4, lines 16-40 and column 7, lines 8-29);

controller means (processor; column 3, lines 25-45) for controlling said interface and said decoder (controlling the system; column 3, lines 25-45); and

output means (input/output interfaces; column 3, lines 25-43) for connecting said decoder board to one or more audiovisual output devices (display, 112 and wireless headphones; column 4, lines 18-20 and lines 20-65).

As to claim 38, Lavelle discloses user input means (pen and touch screen; column 5, lines 57-62) connected to said board for providing user input to said controller means (column 5, lines 57-62).

As to claim 40, Lavelle discloses wherein said decoder decodes a data stream output by any of a dvd player (column 4, lines 16-30) or a wireless receiver (column 4, lines 16-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 31, 34, 35, 37, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lavelle.

As to claims 2, 12, 31 and 37, while Lavelle discloses an interface stage for interfacing said decoder board with a digital data network, he fails to specifically disclose a fiber optic network.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize fiber optic lines for a network of interconnected devices, for the typical benefits that fiber optic lines provide over traditional connections, including volume and weight reduction; lower cost with higher maintainability; no detectable radiation of RF or other signatures; low susceptibility to disruption or damage by nuclear-induced electromagnetic pulse (EMP); and increased link length and bandwidth.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Lavelle's system to include a fiber optic network for the typical advantages provided by fiber optic lines, including volume and weight reduction; lower cost with higher maintainability; no detectable radiation of RF or other signatures; low susceptibility to disruption or damage by nuclear-induced electromagnetic pulse (EMP); and increased link length and bandwidth.

As to claims 3 and 13, while Lavelle discloses wherein said connections for one or more audiovisual output devices comprise headphone connections (column 4, lines 50-65), he fails to specifically disclose a headphone jack.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize headphone jacks, which allow a user to add and remove traditional headphones as needed, for the typical benefit of allowing traditional, well-known headphones to be plugged in and utilized as desired by a user.

Art Unit: 2623

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Lavelle's system to include a headphone jack for the typical benefit of allowing traditional, well-known headphones to be used and removed as desired by a user.

As to claims 5, 15 and 34, while Lavelle discloses a microcontroller (column 3, lines 25-44) and a touch-screen connected to said decoder board (column 5, lines 54-62), said touch screen used to select items and provide user input to said microcontroller which interprets the user input (column 5, lines 54-62), he fails to specifically disclose menu images displayed on the audiovisual output device and selected by the user.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to display a menu of items to a user, such as in a media system with a plurality of different items available for presentation, as described by Lavelle, for the typical benefit of allowing a user to easily identify and select the media they are interested in from a plurality of options.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Lavelle's system to include menu images displayed on the audiovisual output device and selected by the user for the typical benefit of allowing a user to easily identify and select the media they are interested in from a plurality of options.

Art Unit: 2623

As to claims 6, 16 and 35, Lavelle discloses wherein said decoder outputs a decoded video signal to said audiovisual output device for display (column 5, lines 19-29 and line 48-column 6, line 42).

As to claims 8, 18 and 39, while Lavelle discloses wherein the decoder board decodes a plurality of different types of media content (column 4, lines 16-40 and column 5, lines 30-42) and provided for required content protection (encryption/decryption; column 6, lines 28-42), he fails to specifically disclose MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, Motion JPEG and VCD data streams.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize, and decode, well known data stream standards, such as MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, Motion JPEG and VCD, when providing a plurality of different media types, as described by Lavelle, for the typical benefit of allowing a user to receive and display media which is in accordance with one of a plurality of well-known, widely distributed *standards*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Lavelle's system to include MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, Motion JPEG, VCD data streams for the typical benefit of allowing a user to receive and display media which is in accordance with one of a plurality of well-known, widely distributed *standards*.

Art Unit: 2623

As to claims 10, 20 and 41, while Lavelle discloses wherein the decoder board decodes a plurality of different types of media content (column 4, lines 16-40 and column 5, lines 30-42), he fails to specifically disclose MP3.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize, and decode, well known data stream standards, such as MP3, when providing a plurality of different media types, as described by Lavelle, for the typical benefit of allowing a user to receive and display media which is in accordance with a well-known, widely distributed *standard*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Lavelle's system to include MP3 for the typical benefit of allowing a user to receive and display media which is in accordance with a well-known, widely distributed *standard*.

As to claim 21, while Lavelle discloses a data storage device connected to the digital data network (column 3, lines 41-44), he fails to specifically disclose a hard drive.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize a hard drive, which can provide a large rewritable storage space at low cost, for data storage, for the typical benefit of utilizing a well known rewritable storage device which can provide large storage space at a low cost.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Lavelle's system to include a hard drive for the typical

Art Unit: 2623

benefit of utilizing a well known rewritable storage device which can provide large storage space at a low cost.

As to claim 23, while Lavelle discloses a data storage device connected to the digital data network (column 3, lines 41-44), he fails to specifically disclose a floppy disk drive.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize a well-known floppy disk drive, which utilizes removable disks for data to easily be moved from one location to another, for the typical benefit of utilizing a well known rewritable storage device for easily mobility in moving data from one system to another.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Lavelle's system to include a floppy disk drive for the typical benefit of utilizing a well known rewritable storage device for easily mobility in moving data from one system to another.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 06/16/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. On page 9, of applicant's response, Lavelle does not disclose an interface stage for interfacing with a digital data network and further that Lavelle does not disclose a digital data network whatsoever.

In response, as indicated in the previous rejections, Lavelle specifically discloses a digital bus, which can comprise a single wire, which will interconnect a plurality of different devices (170, 172; Figs. 1A and 1B; column 4, line 66-column 5, line 7 and column 9, line 60-column 10, line 2). The interconnection of a plurality of devices is, by definition, a network. Applicant is further provided with the appropriate pages of the IEEE 100 Dictionary, which states “a network is any set of devices or subsystems connected by links joining (directly or indirectly) a set of terminal nodes.” (page 726, network (7)). Thus, applicant’s argument that Lavelle does not disclose a digital data network is not persuasive.

Furthermore, in regards to the “interface stage for interfacing with a digital data network”, as Lavelle clearly discloses wherein the system comprises “input/output interfaces” (column 3, lines 25-43) and wherein the system “interfaces” with the digital data network (as all of the devices connect with the bus; see Figs. 1A-1B), this clearly meets the claim limitation of an interface stage for interfacing with a digital data network, thus applicant’s argument is not persuasive.

b. On page 9, applicant argues that the “signal processing/conversion facilities” is not a “multi-format decoder for decoding at least two different encoding formats for an audio-visual stream.”

In response, Lavelle specifically discloses wherein signal processing/conversion facilities, 127 perform decoding (column 6, lines 28-33),

and thus clearly meets the limitation of a “decoder”. Furthermore, Lavelle discloses wherein the signal processing/conversion facilities, 127, can perform decoding for the inputs of *any* of the input devices (wherein each device is capable of it’s own *encoding* and the facilities, 127, performs all of the decoding column 6, lines 37-42). As the inputs include a large plurality of different devices with different formats (see column 4, lines 16-30 and column 5, lines 30-42), the signal processing/conversion facilities clearly qualifies as a “multi-format decoder for decoding at least two different encoding formats for an audio-visual stream”, and thus applicant’s arguments are not persuasive.

c. In response to applicant’s arguments on page 10, in regards to the “multi-format decoder”, see the rejections and (b) above.

Furthermore, it is unclear how applicant feels that the use of a DSP and or performing encoding and decoding does not describe a “multi-format decoder”, as a device *performing decoding* for a plurality of different formats clearly meets the claim limitation of a “multi-format decoder”.

d. In response to applicant’s arguments on page 10, in regards to the “multi-format decoder”, see the rejections and (b) and (c) above.

e. In response to applicant’s arguments, on page 11, that Lavelle does not disclose a “microcontroller for controlling said interface stage and said decoder”,

applicant is again directed to column 3, lines 25-45, disclosing the implementation of the system. More specifically Lavelle specifically discloses wherein the entire system is implemented and controlled by a computer platform consisting of a CPU, RAM and I/O. This clearly reads upon the claimed “microcontroller for controlling said interface stage and said decoder”, and thus applicant’s arguments are not convincing.

f. In response to applicant’s arguments on page 11, in regards to claim 7, Lavelle specifically discloses wherein the signal processing conversion facilities, 127, will process audio signals (which includes decoding, as shown above and in column 6, lines 20-30) and then provide those signals for transmission over the bus (which consists of a digital data network, as indicated above) for output (see Fig. 1A and 1B and column 6, lines 20-27). Thus, applicant’s arguments are not persuasive.

g. On page 12, in regards to claim 9, applicant argues that Lavelle does not disclose “wherein said decoder decodes a data stream”. In response, as indicated above, Lavelle specifically discloses wherein the signal processing conversion facilities, 127, will perform *decoding* for the output of any of the input devices (column 6, lines 27-42), which clearly meets the claim limitation of “wherein said decoder decodes a data stream”. Furthermore, Lavelle specifically discloses wherein the input devices include a DVD player (column 4, lines 16-40)

and a wireless receiver (such as an AM/FM radio or a TV tuner; column 4, lines 16-40 and Fig. 1A).

h. In response to applicant's arguments on page 13, in regards to "a digital data network installed in a vehicle", applicant is directed to the rejections and (a)-(g) above, and column 4, lines 16-20 of Lavelle, wherein it is clearly shown that Lavelle discloses "a digital data network installed in a vehicle".

i. In response to applicant's arguments on page 13, in regards to "providing an encoded audiovisual datastream", applicant is directed to the rejections and (a)-(h) above. Lavelle specifically discloses "input device" providing audio-visual datastreams (such as DVD, television and games; column 4, lines 16-20 and column 5, lines 30-42) and wherein the datastreams from the input devices are received and *decoded* by the signal processing/conversion facilities (column 6, lines 28-42). Thus, applicant's arguments are not persuasive as Lavelle clearly discloses "providing an encoded audiovisual datastream".

j. In response to applicant's arguments on pages 14-20, applicant is directed to the previous rejections and (a)-(i) above, wherein these arguments have already been addressed and refuted in regards to the previous claims.

k. The examiner thanks applicant for indicating the typo in regards to claim 4, as claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and not under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

l. In response to applicant's arguments on page 21, in regards to claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 31, 34, 35, 37, 39 and 41, applicant is directed to the rejections and (a)-(i) above, in regards to the independent claims.

m. On page 21, applicant traverses the Official Notice, presented in claims 2, 12, 31 and 37, in regards to utilizing fiber optic lines for a network of interconnected devices.

In response, applicant is directed to Lotocky et al. (5,848,367) disclosing the use of a fiber optic line to interconnect a plurality of devices (column 4, lines 6-26) in a vehicle (Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 67).

n. In response to applicant's assertion on page 21, in regards to claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 34, 35 and 39, that applicant has "doubts" about the assertions taken in the Official Notices, it is noted that the MPEP clearly states that to adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must *specifically* point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art... If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion

of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate."

See MPEP 2144.03

In this case, applicant has not *specifically* pointed out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. The blanket statement that applicant has "doubts" about the assertions does not point out any specific error or reason as to why the fact was not common knowledge or well-known in the art, and thus does not constitute a proper traversal.

Thus the utilization of headphone jacks, menu images displayed on the audiovisual output device and selected by the user, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, Motion JPEG and VCD data streams, MP3, hard drives and floppy disk drives, is taken to be admitted prior art because the traversal was inadequate.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2623

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kearns (6,072,535) disclosing an audio/visual system utilizing fiber optic bus connections.

Weinberger et al. (6,813,777) disclosing the use of headphone jacks, a hard-drive and a floppy disk drive in a vehicle.

Sklar et al. (5,990,928) disclosing a vehicle system with a displayed menu listing selectable content.

Tagawa et al. (4,866,515) disclosing a vehicle system with a displayed menu listing selectable content.

Reinold et al. (6,175,628) disclosing a video system for decoding MPEG 1, MPEG 2, MPEG 4 and Motion JPEG.

Safadi (US 2002/0146237) disclosing a vehicle system for decoding MPEG 2 and MP3.

Art Unit: 2623

Ficco (US 2002/0178451) disclosing a vehicle system which decodes VCD, MP3, MPEG 1 and MPEG 2.

8. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. () _____ - _____ on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Sheleheda whose telephone number is (571) 272-7357. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James Sheleheda
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2623

JS


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600